

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested based upon the following remarks.

Currently, claims 1-11 and 21-36 remain pending in the present application including independent claims 1 and 21. In the Office Action, claims 1 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Blackwood in view of Moriwaki. In particular, the Office Action states that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to "have employed an aqueous dipping solution to apply the coating onto the fabric as shown by Blackwood, et al. on the fabric of Moriwaki, et al." In response, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to combine Blackwood with Moriwaki as alleged in the Office Action.

Blackwood, for instance, is directed to a method of coating a substrate with a curable composition that includes:

- 1) a curable elastomeric polymer;
- 2) an aqueous polyurethane dispersion; and optionally
- 3) a cure agent.

In stark contrast to Blackwood, however, Moriwaki specifically teaches away from using an elastomer resin, such as the natural and synthetic rubbers disclosed in column 4 of Blackwood.

In particular, Moriwaki states in column 1 that when a fabric is coated with an elastomer resin, the air bag produced can be very heavy, hard and coarse in appearance. Moriwaki further teaches that fabrics coated with an elastomer resin are hard to fold and can in fact harm a passenger when inflated. At line 36 in column 1, Moriwaki discusses using elastomer resins at reduced coating weights which may provide an improvement in appearance and foldability. Moriwaki, however, states specifically that "**such improvement is not regarded as sufficient. Furthermore, the coating or lamination with the elastomer resin requires a complicated process, with attendant problems in productivity**" (emphasis added).

Thus, Moriwaki clearly teaches away from using an elastomer resin and thus it would not have been obvious to combine the fabric in Moriwaki with the coating composition disclosed in Blackwood.

In addition, Applicant does not in any way admit that Blackwood is prior art to the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

In the Office Action, dependent claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C §103 over Blackwood and Moriwaki and further in view of Weil. In response, Applicant submits that Weil does nothing to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Blackwood and Moriwaki. As such, Applicant submits that claim 35 patentably defines over the cited prior art.

In summary, Applicant submits that the present application is in complete condition for allowance. Should any issues remain after consideration of this Response, then Examiner Singh is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned at his or her convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Timothy A. Cassidy
Reg. No. 38,024
P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602
(864) 271-1592
(864) 233-7342

September 21, 2007
Date